

between 50 and 90 percent of the population lived on a family farm. The world has changed since this system was set up. Agricultural property is not necessarily a reflector of wealth, in fact, it may well be a reflector of poverty. Therefore, to condition the financing simply upon who owns the property, and remember in half the cases the property is really, truly owned by the bank or the financial institution since they have 50 or 80 percent of the loan on it, because we rely so heavily on property we have created a condition in which you have property land grab wars. Those who are property short do everything to gain the one thing that can finance their system and lower their property taxes which is to gain somebody else's property. That is the condition we have today, and that is the issue in 662. What does the amendment do? The amendment guts the bill and sets up the principle that within the next three years this Legislature will, shall and must have in place a new system for financing education, and that new system will not rely on property for more than one-third of the financing of education. Now in answer to the question you haven't asked but is in all your minds, how is it all going to work, I don't have that answer nor does Senator Carsten, nor does anybody in the room. We have ideas that this is the goal. We have a 36 month period to systematically get to that goal. That may mean a change next year in the tax system. It may mean a local income tax such as Senator Sieck and I think Senator Remmers have at times (inaudible). I don't know what it means. I do know it means simply this, the goal is to shift the financing of education off of property and onto methods that more truly reflect wealth or ability to pay and are more equitable. Yes, the amendment guts the bill. Yes, it leaves unresolved the immediate issue of the Class I's and the tax thing. I have another amendment. I'd like to see it go in the same bill, that is one I'll offer later if the bill is still alive. That other proposal is, at least for the immediate future, as I suggested to you last time we have all Class I's for taxation purposes for their high school payments only, valued just like they would under Amendment 4 and all other property, but taxed at a uniform rate, let's say three-quarters of one percent, and that money distributed on a pro rata basis for the number of students in a particular school. You are going to, yet this year, have to face up to the free high crisis. I term it a crisis now where it might not have been when we last talked about this issue because of the court decisions. Since we last talked court decisions have generated a crisis. Now